



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,487	08/23/2001	Robert F. Rioux	BSC-187 (1002/257)	1401
21323	7590	01/26/2004		
TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP HIGH STREET TOWER 125 HIGH STREET BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3738		11		

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/935,487

Applicant(s)

RIOUX ET AL.

Examiner

Brian E Pellegrino

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evard et al. (WO 97/27898). Fig. 2' illustrates a coil segment with a middle portion **14** spaced from the proximal and distal windings and has a diameter less than the proximal and distal ends. Evard et al. disclose a covering or what can be interpreted as "webbing" such that a portion or the entire device is encapsulated or covered by the covering, page 33, lines 5-8. It can be interpreted from the disclosure of Evard on page 14, lines 22-25 that these coverings inhibit ingrowth of body tissue. Evard also discloses the coil can be a biocompatible wire made from steel or nickel titanium, page 34, lines 1-3. Evard additionally discloses that the different features of various embodiments are capable of being combined to form embodiments not shown, page 45, lines 31-36. Please note the intended use, as set forth in the claims, carries no weight in the absence of any distinguishing structure. Clearly, the device is capable of being positioned coaxially within the body lumen of a patient.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evard et al. (WO 97/27898) in view of Yachia et al. (5246445). Evard et al. is explained supra. However, Evard does not disclose a cross-sectional area of the wire within the range of 0.0079mm^2 to 7.1mm^2 or separation of the windings within the range of 0.5mm to 10mm or the use of hooks at each of the proximal and distal ends of the prosthetic device. Yachia et al. teach a cross-sectional area of 0.0079mm^2 to 0.785mm^2 and a separation of the windings with a range 0.5-2mm, col. 4, lines 44,45,49-52. Yachia et al. also teach (Fig. 1a) a stent with hooks 3 at both the proximal and distal ends of the coil body for connection to a delivery system, col. 6, lines 13-16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a wire with the cross-sectional area and spacing distance of 0.5-2mm between windings as taught by Yachia et al. with the device of Evard et al. in order to provide some flexibility by having some distance between windings, but also some greater structural support with the larger cross-sectional area wire. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate hooks at both proximal and distal ends of a stent as taught Yachia et al. in the device of Evard et al. such that the vessel apparatus does not dislodge from the instrument used to implant it. The addition of the hooks enables the surgeon to precisely place the vessel-opening device in its location without the apparatus being displaced during insertion.

Claims 7,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evard et al. (WO 97/27898) in view of Hachtman et al. (5645559). Evard et al. is explained supra. Evard does disclose that silicone can be used in sleeves placed on

Art Unit: 3738

stent devices, page 17, lines 21-24. However, Evard does not disclose a low durometer silicone within the range of 0-60D. Hachtman et al. also teach that a silicone layer is placed on the stent to provide a barrier that prevents the growth of tissue through the stent and to support the flow of fluid through the lumen, col. 2, lines 14-18. Hachtman et al. also teach that low durometer silicone, such as 30D is placed on a stent, col. 4, lines 49-52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a low durometer silicone as taught by Hachtman et al. for the silicone on Evard's vessel apparatus such that fluid flow is maintained through the lumen of the device while preventing tissue ingrowth.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/6/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that Evard's device is for a different use, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Art Unit: 3738

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E Pellegrino whose telephone number is 703-306-5899. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9am to 6:30pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached at (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

Brian Pellegrino

TC 3700, AU 3738

David Isabella

Primary Examiner

David J. Isabella
Primary Examiner